

SECRET

Re : General situation in the Ukrainian SSR in July -Sept 1968

Source :

Date : 5 Nov 1968

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
SOURCES METHOD EXEMPTION 3020  
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT  
DATE 2007

1. This is a report on the sojourn of the Source in the Ukraine from 24 July to 24 Sept 1968. Source went there as a visitor of her relatives in Romaniv, r-n Peremyshlany, Lvov obl. but most of her time spent in Lvov, and Kiev, making also "on the side trips" to Uzhgorod, Odessa, Chernivtsi, Kamyanets-Podilsky and Khotyn. In Romaniv she had her uncles and aunts and stayed with one of them. In Lvov and Kiev she stayed with writers and scholars, at their private homes and not in hotels. Source is 19 years old, <sup>single</sup> German citizen of Ukrainian parents, with strong Ukrainian feelings, proud of being a young Ukrainian poetess, a leading SDS-member very active in demonstrations and other SDS activities, first year university student of Slavistics and Germanistics in Munich, Germany. Strangely enough she managed to reconcile her Ukrainian feelings and interests with very strong communist conviction of Mao-Che Guevara brand and modern anarchism. A "moderate" beatnik by appearance, Source is very intelligent, very well read (particularly in sociology, Marxim, Leninism, Marcuse, Debray etc), fully absorbed by politics of the SDS and Ukrainian poetry, at the same time rather unevenly developed in other aspects, emotionally still rather immature and unsettled. A real "enfant terrible" for her parents <sup>who are</sup> highly respected intellectuals in both, Ukrainian and German circles. Deeply involved and <sup>protestively</sup> "mature" in politics but still rather naive and "youngish" in general. Also with strong tendency to publicly demonstrate her "anti-feelings" with slight undertones for public "scandalism" or as she puts it - "I like to upset and make angry 'old people' by openly demonstrating my feelings against them". (Old she understands in this context as "reactionary"). She is against all kind of establishment, or rather claims to be. Thus she is against German, Soviet, American, emigre-Ukrainian and any other establishment but does not attack Maoist or Fidelist regimes which she excludes from the category of "real establishments".

Lois Remick  
2 Dec 68

During student leftist demonstrations in Frankfurt/Main in 1967/1968 she quite often seen on television in the avantgarde of the SDS. Brothers Wolfe (?), Dutschke and others are good friends of her. She also knows personally Con Benditt .

10 days before her departure for Ukraine , Source registered her <sup>formal</sup> membership with the SDS.

Originally Source was refused Soviet visa as a visitor and instead P.G. WOLOKHIN (Wolochin) , Third Secretary of the Consulate Dept. of the Soviet Embassy in Bonn, suggested that she goes as a tourist. After Source registered with the SDS she was given a visitor's visa several days after her registration. Source is inclined to infer that her <sup>formal</sup> membership with the SDS was instrumental in obtaining visitor's visa.

2. On 23 July 1968 Subject left by train from Frankfurt to Prague and around 23.00 departed from Prague for Chop. At the Prague Rk Station she met <sup>with</sup> Zilynsky's ex-wife Ludmila and her present husband (Jancek). On the train she met a young student from Uzhgorod - CHENDEY Vasil, brother of the Ukrainian writer CHENDEY Ivan. Together they traveled to Chop. The talk was about general situation in the CSSR and in the Ukraine, literature and art. Next morning they arrived at Chop. At the Chop Rk Station Chendey said good-by and Source was left alone. She was soon taken care by an Inturist female agent and customs officers. The latter were particularly interested in Source's Super-Technica camera, six officers looked at it from all angles but finally she convinced them that she took it to make pictures of art. Even more they were interested in her poetry collection\*. Source took 10 exemplares with her. In the beginning the female Inturist agent asked her why she was speaking Ukrainian but after Source turned out to be a Ukrainian poetess she ( the agent) left her in peace. Incidentally , Source replying to the agent attacked her why she, a Ukrainian official, was speaking Russian and not Ukrainian. The female replied she was not from here. Two of the customs officers looked through her collection , read a few pages , and asked for a copy to be retained. Source gladly agreed to and wrote down a dedication " With socialist greetings" The whole procedure lasted for about one hour and then they let her go.

\* Published by 'Sachnovsky' 1968

3. After 4 hour stop at Chop, on 24 July 1968, Source left by train for Lvov. A well dressed lady of approx. 35 years old and <sup>with</sup> heavy make-up volunteered to keep Source company and asked for chewing gum, nylon pullovers, underwear and finally dollars. She was willing to buy them all. Source replied that she had nothing to sell and indicated quite strongly she was not interested in the new acquaintance. Instead she preferred to converse with a Persian student studying in Moscow. A Russian couple in the same compartment was quite surprised the Source spoke Ukrainian. They took her for a Polish student. Around 20.00 hrs Source arrived at Lvov where she was met by her uncle. By taxi they went at once to Romaniv.

4. Following is the gist of Source's impressions of the countryside. Elderly generations are strongly dissatisfied with the present situation. In their view the living conditions under Polish and German occupation, particularly under the former, were, definitely better. <sup>But</sup> it's not the living standard only that matters. Actually most people work now much easier and live perhaps even better than in the past. Source observed that no one was in a hurry to go to work to collective farm, quite a few people were staying at home, going to the market in Lvov, or just simply idling. She saw no one starving or without "necessary clothes." Most houses, however, were not in a very good shape. When she asked her relatives why didn't they do something about it, they replied, "why should we work for the Soviets, it's no longer ours". In Source's opinion this notion of "this is not ours" is what really troubles the peasants and makes them so dissatisfied.

There is a deep gulf between the mass of collective farmers and the kolsosp administration. The latter is a real new aristocracy. As a rule they have a villa, 2 cows, a car, a piano and "other paraphernalia of the new Soviet bourgeoisie". Source's uncle (one of the uncles) belongs to this aristocracy. He is a forester, a party member, with a 100 Rubel salary per month, plus wood, and other "on the side incomes". His wife is an agronom in the collective farm (im. Shchorsa) and earns "altogether" Rubel 200.- per month.

Source was discussing all those "acute" problems she observed with her relatives and others. They told her she was still very naive and did not understand what is life in the Soviet Union. Of course they are and will be social differences between collective farmers and "nachalstvo",

as well as there will be always a gap between working class and intelligentsia. These are facts of life and Soviet system won't change it either.

With some peasants Source raise the question whether they would like to get their land back. Some said yes, the other replied "by no means no, I would be quite satisfied with kolhosp if they would just pay us more for working days. "

Black market is flourishing. Its "operations " start in Lvov at 5 or 6 a.m. Already on the eve everything gets ready in Romanov - packing <sup>of vegetables, butter</sup> loading etc. The villagers want to be in Lvov before 7 a.m. ,i.e. before "collective farm market" opens.

In Source's opinion young generation is not sufficiently interested in politics. Most of them are in Komsomol but know nothing about Marx, Engels, Lenin. Actually they don't care about "communism" at all. In the local library Source observed that Marxist classicists were not touched for years and rested under heavy lay of dust. People were reading only novels and not too many either.

Young people's main interest is "to get to the city, to higher school, to university, to get a good job" and football. Also horilka in which elderly generations share equally eagerly. The drunkenness is of massive proportions unseen of in the West. Source discussed this problem later on with Ivan DZIUBA who told her that this "plague" came from Russia where it caused catastrophic results. A high percentage of children were born retarded (~~many of them~~), many people were suffering from liver and other illnesses, a general stupefaction of whole generations was on march. If this kind of drunkenness won't moderate it might have very serious sociological consequences for Soviet society in the future.

Elderly people still do not approve of the party membership but the young don't care. They ( the young) understand that party membership is not only helpful in their careers but also means of "being something".

Militia and KGB are in Peremyshany , rayon center, and in Lvov. In the village they have seksots and people know about them. Source was told about Slavko CHEKH ( aged 35), GURASH, fnu ( aged 35-40), and Halyna Chekh ( aged 35-40) who allegedly work for militia and KGB. They were also called provocateurs. But in reality no one takes them seriously. One evening , in the village club ,people had their usual

"token" of entertainment and horilka and the band started playing "Shche ne vmerla Ukrayina" and "U luzi chervona kalyna". There were present all three of the seksots and perhaps many others but no one cared.

In the countryside all speak Ukrainian. Administration is local, school (desiatylitka) is Ukrainian, teachers are local or Ukrainians from Eastern oblasts.

5. After Source's arrival in Romaniv there was a general war panic. People were talking about war to come and acted accordingly. They were buying and storing flour, soap, fat etc. They were surprised Source's parents let their daughter go to the Soviet Union at such a critical time. The war was to be between the Soviet Union and the West - US, West Germany "and others". Still in March many drivers, mainly truck drivers were called to the army for "re-training". Since then there were several partial mobilizations of young people up to 30 years old. Some "mobilizations" took place at night. There was also a lot of troops all over West Ukraine. No one believed these were here just for maneuvers. When the Soviet army marched into CSSR some people thought the West will defend Czechs and Slovaks.

6. The nearby rayon center Peremyshlany is rather russified. There are Russians in administration, militia, and party leadership. It was explained to Source that Peremyshlany was never a Ukrainian town and after Jews and Poles were removed, Russians came in great numbers. Source was told that On 17 Aug 1968 the commander of Peremyshlany garrison shot himself because it was discovered that some important documents had disappeared from his desk, or safe. People also talked that he was issuing some false military identification papers and was caught.

7. On 5 Aug 1968 Source "moved" to Lvov where she stayed with Ihor KALYNYTS and his wife. Both are active members of "dissidents". Ihor is working now in oblast archiv and has a very bad boss. His wife Irena (Ira) is working in a school library in Lvov. She has a PhD degree in philology. Ihor is under pressure to write articles against "bourgeois nationalists" but he refuses to. As a result lately his poetry collection was withdrawn from the publishing house. To Kalynets Source "formally" went via IVANYCHUK Roman, poet, works in "Zhovten"; KUDLYK Roman, now with a RR-paper after he had protested last year against arrests of Chornovil and others; and ILNYTSKY ~~Mykola~~ Mykola who still "hangs around" with Zhovten.

With help of Kalynets and their friends Source met a good many "dissidents" in Lvov and then got a "formal" access to DZIUBA, SVITLYCHNY and others in Kiev.

8. On <sup>news</sup> 24 Aug 1968 Mykhailo and Bogdan HORYN returned from Mordovia. This was brought by Kalynets who went to visit them. Kalynets have a 6 year old daughter who stays all the time with her grandma in Khodoriv and they visit Khodoriv every weekend.

Ihor was involved in Horyn's case and "behind the scenes" Horyns' mother was even saying that she could not understand why only her sons were sentenced and Ihor let go free.

Kalynets went to visit Horyns together with Stefa Sharabura, Luba MAKSYMIV and a Tania (medical doctor) but without Source. They thought it was better she wouldn't go.

HORYNS were to stay in KHODORIV and could not move out of town. They had to report every day to militia, and in case they would like to make a trip they would have to get a special permit.

9. Beside HORYNS also other "Mordovians" with sentences up to 3 years like HIL and HEVRYCH have been released.

MOROZ Valentin was brought to Kiev and was to be tried again for his "Reportage from the Beria's Preserve". <sup>lev</sup> LUKIANENKO was also recently brought to Kiev, shown opera performance, libraries, factories, given a ride on Dipro-River and promised even a trip to his native Chernigov-area. All that and more just to disclose how the zakhalavny materials are being smuggled out of the camp. He was even promised a full rehabilitation. LUKIANENKO resigned from a trip to Chernigov and asked to be brought back to Mordovia.

Also VIRUN has been released. According to people from Kiev he agreed to co-operate with the KGB and a warning went out to watch him because he might try to make some provocations.

10. OSADCHY Mykhailo is still without a job but the chief of Lvov KGB promised him to find one soon. He also promised him to register in Lvov. Osadchy's wife is working, gets Rubel 70 per month. (Source forgot in what capacity, anyway as some sort of a clerk). Recently OSADCHY was "given" a new friend" ( Osadchy and his friends were sure this was

arranged by the KGB) who liked to keep him company and did not mind spending money to meet Osadchy's wishes. Thus, while Source was there, the "friend" bought Osadchy several volumes of Kant and other books and even a Turkish headkerchief for his wife. By nature OSADCHY is very optimistic and even enjoys his present situation.

11. From talking with "dissidents" in Lvov Source got the impression that their movement is quite massive and this was only because of that that "authorities" or "organs" did not undertake an all-out "action" against them. The young Ukrainian movement was growing much stronger than Source could imagine and what particularly pleased her was the fact that it had explicit political and not only literary undertones and features. Adding her impression from Kiev where she spoke with DZIUBA, SVITLYCHNY, KOTSIUBYNKA, KIRIAN, VOROBYOB, SACHENKO and others, she observed that in this new movement literary and political elements were intertwined and could not be actually separated. As to political features of this movement, in her opinion, these were by no means homogeneous but rather differentiated. She distinguished two main trends; one which she would identify with DZIUBA and his alike, and the other ~~one~~ identified with SVITLYCHNY and KALYNETS and their alike. DZIUBA is putting emphasis on his communist convictions and necessity to "rebuild" the party and through party and administration to "liberate" Ukraine. Accordingly he also puts the emphasis on contacts with leftist circles abroad and is against any "underground" activities which would give "the organs" pretext to liquidate Ukrainian young movement as a "conspiracy".

The other trend is less concerned with communist ideology and exclusively evolutionary forms of struggle, it rather gravitates to purely "national" program and is not against some sort of "organization" if necessary.

Both trends, however, stress that only through a further strengthening of national consciousness in masses it will be possible to achieve their goal and despite recent setbacks they appraise present developments in the long run quite optimistic. As their main achievement at present they point out the fact that more and more "technical intelligentsia" is joining their ranks.

12. The knowledge about Zakhalavny publications abroad was widespread, particularly in circles of people Source conversed with.

\* Literature which has not been published in the Soviet Union & which is circulated from person to person.

SECRET

About emigration in general they were not very well informed. Actually beside bahderivtsi they knew <sup>only</sup> ~~about~~ <sup>ZP/2911</sup> uhaverivtsi or Prolog-Suchasnist, and melnykivtsi of Ukrainske Slovo of Paris.

Some people asked Source whether it was true Prolog and Suchasnist were in contact with American intelligence. Source thought that this "rumor" was coming not only from "authorities" but also from MURASHKO Pavlo and other people from Presov area.

13. Source got so enchanted with people she met in Lvov that she decided to study in Ukraine. Around 10 August she went to the Society for Cultural Contacts with Ukrainian Abroad and presented her case. She was received by a YAREMKO, fnu, chief of the Lvov Society, aged 37-40, Ukrainian from eastern oblasts, at his office in Gorky street, in the House of Scholar. He~~x~~ told her that he was not competent in those matters and sent her to Oblvykonkom. Source went there and told one of the officials what she wanted. She stirred a real turmoil after she explained that she was even willing to remain <sup>in</sup> the Ukraine for good if this was a condition for her studies. 12 individuals incl. the chief and all his deputies surrounded her and could not overcome their amazement of what she was telling them. One or two went to the other room and after a while told her to come next day and that her case will be handled by a deputy of the chief of Oblvykonkom. Next day Source came to Oblvykonkom and when she came to TELISHEVSKY it turned <sup>out</sup> that it was not him who was to handle her case but someone else. After some enquiries TELISHEVSKY led her to the chief's office who was the only one who knew that her case will be in hands of Comrade ZHELIKHOVSKY.

The chief led her to ZHELIKHOVSKY whose "office" was just being renovated and as it turned out later on he had to use other people's rooms.

ZHELIKHOVSKY was approx. 38-40 years old, 168 cm., stocky, pale square face ("as though he was sitting all the time in a cellar"), greyish eyes, black wavy hair combed back, "very elegant", smooth, well dressed, "polite and tactful". "Just not like a Soviet".

SECRET



Source presented her case and asked him whether it was possible to study without giving up her German citizenship. She was told it was not and that she would have to relinquish her citizenship and obtain the Soviet one. When Source pointed out that she knew other foreign students studied and lived in the Ukraine, ZHELIKHOVSKY replied that it was possible in Moscow or Leningrad and only under exchange student scheme. Moreover, they had a rather bad experience with foreign students like Source. "Thus we had, for instance, a Kolaska from Canada of whom you certainly heard who after we taught him and fed, he paid us off with treason and slander". "O no, no, we can't do something like that again". Source agreed then to resign from her German citizenship and was told to write an application for the Soviet one. She was also told that because of her age (adolescence) she will have to get an approval from her parents. And in the meantime write a biography and full explanation of her decision.

14. Following is the gist of subsequent interviews with Zhelikhovsky. He asked her in detail about her biography and told her to write it down. He knew before she told him that she was a member of the SDS and on friendly terms with Wolffe, Con Bendit and others. He did not know, however, that she personally knew Rudi Dutschke. He knew that SDS had about 2,000 registered members and told her that while she was in the Ukraine a split took place in Frankfurt SDS. He knew exactly that one faction was dogmatist and the other - neo-Marxist. ZHELIKHOVSKY asked Source to describe to him the French SDS. He wanted to know how many there were Maoists, Trotskyists, CheGuevarists, anarchists and others. She knew little about the French and could not tell him much. Actually her impression was that she knew less about those things than Zhelikhovsky.

At one interview Zhelikhovsky told her that he is preparing her case ~~xxx~~ as that of "a political resettler of Category ~~1~~ two". This is based on her explanation in which she wrote that she wanted to live and study among Ukrainians and that capitalist environment was not conducive to her poetic creativity.

At another interview ZHELIKHOVSKY asked her whether she would write against emigre nationalists. She replied that this depended on what she wanted to write but basically she was not against it. However,

this did not mean she would write "against" but rather "about". This question was put to her after a longer discussion of emigre matters. Zhelikhovsky asked Source whether she knew who was now the leader of Banderivtsi. She was not sure who and he told her it was Stetsko. What did she think of banderivtsi? Source replied she considered them to be Ukrainian fascists. Zhelikhovsky seemed to be very satisfied with her answer. Then after a while he said that Source's father was a nationalist too. That's her father's business - she replied - but she thought he was not a nationalist. Anyway he was not a banderivets. What did she have against banderivtsi? Reply + Nothing, except that they are reactionaries and idiots. He liked it even more. But they are strong - Zhelikhovsky remarked. Source replied: Yes, in numbers. What about the youth? It's getting assimilated and Source agreed with him. Then Zhelikhovsky added, "but one has to admit that banderivska youth in SUM keeps them attached to their Ukrainian nationality". Source agreed with him adding that this was definitely true to a greater extent than in case of Plast. Zhelikhivsky pretended to be genuinely worried about the fate of Ukrainian youth abroad.

At one point Zhelikhovsky said that Source was writing in Suchasnist and Suchasnist published her collection which she brought with her. Why did she do it? Why not - was the answer, finally Suchasnist is the only liberal magazine abroad where one could write anything one wants. <sup>Even Marxists can write there</sup> Zhelikhovsky did not comment, just made a somewhat "acid" face.

What does she think about Shlakh peremohy? Reply: this is a stupid paper almost like your Pravda or Izvestia. By the way why don't you do something about your papers? Zhelikhovsky did not answer just made a face even more "acid" than usual in case of her negative answers.

At one meeting Zhelikhovsky raised again the question of her parents and told her they were anti-Soviet. And if they are not they should return to the Ukraine. Source replied she was speaking for herself not for her parents.

Zhelkhovsky also mentioned once or twice that he knew she had some good friends in Lvov like Ivanychuk and Ilnytsky. How did she like them? They are fine - she replied. Zhelikhovsky did not mention

others.

On several occasions Zhelikhovsky started "about Marxism-Leninism and ideology in general". Every time he soon gave up as it turned out this was not his strong side.

At one interview, in the very beginning, together with Zhelikhovsky there was also a colleague of his. He did not say one word except for "Dobryy den'" and "Zdrastuyte". Zhelikhovsky led the interview as usual.

15. On 20 Aug 1968 Source submitted to Zhelikhovsky her application for Soviet Citizenship addressed to the Government of the USSR. In it she explained that she wanted to live and study in the Soviet Ukraine but not in any other part of the Soviet Union, that she wanted to be among Ukrainians, that she was enchanted by ideals of socialism, (was a Marxist herself) and that spirit of capitalism was not properly conducive to her creativity.

On this occasion she told Zhelikhovsky that she would like at the same time join the CPSU. Zhelikhovsky smiled and said that for that she would have to wait much longer. <sup>for that</sup> As to her Soviet citizenship, <sup>everything</sup> now all will depend on her parents. If they agree, <sup>saw no</sup> to her resignation from German citizenship he <sup>from the</sup> doesn't see any obstacles on the Soviet side.

16. <sup>Shortly afterwards</sup> ~~Shortly afterwards~~ came an answer from Source's parents <sup>arrived</sup> forbidding her to <sup>resign from</sup> resign from German citizenship and demanding her immediate return home. <sup>Everyone was</sup> All were disappointed, particularly Source. Zhelikhovsky told her that he could do nothing about it. <sup>if</sup> If it were not for her parents, <sup>they would</sup> they would retain her in the Soviet Union without their permission, but "we had already enough trouble with your parents and we don't want to have any more". "Your parents <sup>would not</sup> won't easily give up, embassies and governmental institutions <sup>would become</sup> will get involved, and we don't want to have all this mess on our shoulders". <sup>Don't</sup> So Sorry, but I really can't help you".

Without explaining it he suggested she visits still YAREMKO and tells him about the outcome of her case. Source went to Yaremko, he was very sorry Source could not stay in the Ukraine but he could not help either. Source told him she wanted to go to Kiev and he agreed to help her. He also mentioned LEVISHCHENKO Mykhailo whom she should visit in Kiev and who is a friend of his. YAREMKO mentioned also PETRIV, fnu, the chief of Radio Committee of Lvov.

SECRET

PETRIV, fnu aged approx. 50, could not help either but he made a few notes about Source. It turned out he knew Source's mother from Moscow from the Youth Festival and even showed a photo of her taken in Moscow together which he pulled out of a safe. He also stressed that he was a good friend of IVANYCHUK.

Later on when Source<sup>asked</sup> the latter about PETRIV, she was told that PETRIV indeed was his friend at one time but since he went over to the KGB, their friendship died. PETRIV is specializing now in attacks against emigres.

17. When Source told KALYNETS and others that she was going to rescind her German citizenship and apply for the Soviet one, they looked at her as though she went crazy and warned her she would regret what she was going to do. They also warned her that "they" will try to use her against her parents, and emigres in general, by compelling her to write against them. At that time there was in Lvov ~~also~~ MURASHKO Pavlo from Presov, CSSR and he also told her to abandon her "adventurous irresponsible step" and forget all about it. He was also one of those who draw her attention to the fact that she was under constant surveillance. Murashko suggested she should join young Ukrainians in Paris and do her job there if she was bored in Germany. She was more needed abroad than here. Her other friends in Lvov made it very soon quite clear to her that ZHELIKHOVSKY was no second deputy of the chairman of the Oblvykonkom but a regular KGB officer. Even PETRIV didn't know anybody by that name in Oblvykonkom. Actually, from the very beginning Source herself had no doubts as to who in reality Zhelikhovsky was.

18. On 2 or 3 Sept 1968 Source went by train to Kiev. She arrived there in the morning next day. In Kiev she stayed with LOHVINS. They have a nice apartment, two large rooms, kitchen, bathroom. Lohvyn's wife is Latvian. Out of 4 children only Yurko and Ira are at home. The ~~two~~<sup>other two</sup> are married and live separately. Lohvyn received the gift from VV still on 17 Aug 1968 and was very grateful for it. He also knew who actually sent this gift and asked Source to keep it for herself. At Lohvyns Source met a Ukrainian student from Warsaw (Chylak Aleksander), Stefan Kozak whom she first met in Lvov where he came to pick up his wife, and other friends of ~~theirs~~<sup>theirs</sup>.

From her friends in Lvov ( Kalynets) Source also had contact to SVITLYCHNY Nadia. Through her she met all the important "dissidents" in Kiev.

19. On 6 Sept Source went to Svitlychny's house and then with Lola ( Switlychny's wife) visited together Mykhailyna Kotsiubynska. It was Source's impression that they all already knew about Source. Lola told her that her husband was still without job and the chief of KGB continued to make promises he will get one for him. She also told her how Svitlychny and his company were under heavy surveillance while on vacations in Carpaty Mountains . On their way from Kolomyia to Lvov in July '68 they were stopped <sup>early in the morning</sup> by the KGB in Lvov and taken to the KGB Hqs. There ~~they~~ were searched but after ~~three~~ <sup>on</sup> hours released . Svitlychny had complained later about it to Nikitchenko. The KGB had found an old Bible and wanted to ~~make a case out of it.~~ Also when Svitlychny was visiting Moroz' wife , he was ~~xxx~~ under surveillance. Also their house <sup>is</sup> under watch. Lola complained that they simply were getting fed up with this kind of permanent surveillance. As she put it, "we have a house only to sleep, and talk about weather, but nothing else!" Lola told her also again about Lukianenko's story and Moroz's "fresh trial". She also asked Source how was it actually with those "rumors" about Prolog having contacts with American intelligence.

20. Mykhailyna KOTSIUBYNSKA was still jobless. She also had some problems with her daughter. <sup>Now</sup> she was working on new translations but she doubted they will be published. Although , on the other <sup>hand</sup> just at that time the publishing house took again her translation of Prevera .

21. On 10 Sept 1968 Source met with Ivan SWITLYCHNY and KOCHUR Hryhori at Siayvo bookshop. ~~After~~ that Source met Switlychny two or three times more. Switlychny and Kochur were surprised Source wanted to remain in the Ukraine. Switlychny laughed at her and told her she did not realize what expected her here and that after 6 months she would cry for her mother. Otherwise they talked about general situation in the Ukraine. Switlychny was also interested in Ukrainian youth abroad, present publications aso. He also told her about publishing business in the Ukraine.

KOCHUR mentioned that he spent 10 years in Siberia, and now has some pension. He signed the Protest of 230 ( or 139) and now "they" don't want to print him. On the whole he is under "watchfull eye" and expected a search at his ~~home~~ any day. Recently he noticed some suspicious types around his

SECRET

house in Irpen.

On the same day Ivan Switlychny and Kochur brought Source to Lina KOSTENKO. The latter lets only KOCHUR and SWITLYCHNY into her house. They are the only ones who know her "recognition signal".

KOCHUR mentioned that just lately he managed to get from Lina her poem "Berestechko" and gave <sup>it</sup> to the Publishing House "Dnipro". But he doubted they will publish it.

22. From Lina Source learned about her situation in the Union of Writers of Ukraine. After she, Switlychny, Dziuba and Kotsiubynska Mykhailyna sent their letter to Literaturna Ukrayina protesting against Poltoratsky's article and threatening to send their letter to 40,000 readers in case it won't be published, all four were asked to withdraw the letter. They refused to. Some time after Aug 20, 1968 Lina and Ivan Dziuba received telegrams from the Secretariat of the Union of Writers of Ukraine to appear at their office on 30 Aug 1968. Dziuba was summoned for 3 p.m. and Lina one hour later.

Dziuba probably did not go at all or as usually was 2 hours late, but Lina went. She was met by Oles HONCHAR, Vitali KOROTYCH, PAVLYCHKO Dmytro, ZAHREBELNY Pavlo, KOZACHENKO (?) and one or two others.

HONCHAR was very formal and informed Lina that her refusal to withdraw her signature from under the blackmail-letter to Literaturna Ukraina might result in some very unpleasant consequences, incl. her expulsion from the membership of the Union. Until now the Union had always took in defence her and others alike but this time she really went too far. The Union is responsible for its members and cannot condone acts like "that blackmailing protest". Lina interrupted him that the Union is not to be responsible for her, she is "fully capable to take all the responsibility on her own shoulders".

HONCHAR replied that it was very sad Lina did not want the Union to be responsible for her because as the matters stand now she has only one choice either to revoke her signature and remain under the Union's responsibility or be expelled from the Union and be "<sup>across Table</sup> ~~responsible~~" on her own. Lina asked whether it meant that her expulsion would automatically open the door to her arrest. HONCHAR nodded with his head, and said, "Unfortunately, it is so, you know pretty well that so far no member of the Union was arrested".

Pavlychko was also among those who attacked Lina, and appealed to her responsibility, duty, <sup>and</sup> conscience. <sup>he started about</sup> Kozachenko or someone else started with a pathetic speech and mentioned the brotherly help of our peoples to the Czechoslovak people with whom we are tied by blood. Lina interrupted and remarked, "indeed, if we are tied with them by blood, then perhaps only by blood of menstruation because I can't think of any other". KOZACHENKO was completely confused and shouted something to the effect that if, in the Soviet Union something like Hungary in 1956 or CSSR now, would happen, Soviet individuals would be hanged on trees, and Lina has the audacity to joke about it. At this moment Lina said that she <sup>was</sup> completely serious and wanted on this occasion to state her formal protest against the Soviet invasion in CSSR.

HONCHAR became very upset and said neither he himself nor others present in the room could take <sup>it</sup> into cognizance and "officially" we heard nothing of the sort! He appealed again to Lina to be wise and responsible. Lina repeated her demand to have her protest formally written down into the minutes of the session.

KOROTYCH interrupted her and shouted, "Lina, come to your senses, for God's sake, don't you realise what you are doing?" Lina told him off and suggested he should go home and write his so called poems. HONCHAR nodded with his head and added, "Yes, Vitali, yes, you better go home..."

Lina started to summarize their proceeding and repeated that she was not going to withdraw her signature from the <sup>letter</sup> ~~minutes~~ and insisted on registering her protest against the Soviet invasion of the CSSR.

HONCHAR replied that he was very sorry she refused to withdraw her signature and as to her protest against the invasion, he stated his point of view before, moreover the session was not convoked to deal with such matters. In view of Lina's attitude he sees no other possibility but an exclusion ~~from~~ <sup>of</sup> the membership but this decision can be taken only by the Presidium of the Union which will have its session on 9 Sept 1968 and to which Lina will also be invited.

Lina replied that she was not going to come again to any session and in case Dziuba Ivan should be expelled from the Union she would consider herself expelled ~~as well~~ <sup>as well</sup> even if the Presidium would not act so against her.

On 9 Sept there was no session of the Presidium. Lina was sure that she will be expelled from the Union and then arrested. Dziuba, Svitlychny and others were of a different opinion. Particularly Dziuba was positive "they wouldn't dare". He explained that by arresting Lina and himself or Svitlychny "they" would make heroes out of us and thus expedite ~~the~~ present developments among youth. And "they" were afraid to do it, <sup>furthermore</sup> in case something goes wrong ~~xxx~~ "they" would have to account for it. Dziuba and Svitlychny thought that they won't be even expelled from the Union and that HONCHAR who is again in favors, somehow will smooth it out. He is the first <sup>one</sup> to be interested in keeping Lina and Ivan Dziuba in the Union.

23. Lina Kostenko is being bothered now by TELNIUK, Stanislaw who makes all the efforts to get her sympathy. He sends her gifts; brought her lately perculator, thermos and all kind of goodies. She thinks he was set up by the KGB and she will soon get rid of him. Recently he suggested to her to write a letter to Ukrainians in Argentina and explain that she was free, alive and healthy, and not arrested as melnykivtsi had announced abroad.

24. On 16 Sept 1968 Source met Ivan DZIUBA at Syayvo Bookshop in Kiev. They went for a walk. Dziuba knew about Source and was interested in her decision to remain in the Ukraine. In the beginning he did not approve of her adventure but after her <sup>argumentation and explanation</sup> ~~he said she was right~~ and with her character she could do a lot good in the Ukraine.

Following is the gist of Dziuba's thoughts and opinions on various topics.

a/ Soviet invasion of the CSSR is a serious setback for Ukrainian cause in the Soviet Union. He and his colleagues hoped that the liberalization process in the CSSR will survive and sooner or later spread over to the Soviet Union itself. Of course, the Ukrainian type of liberalization would be quite different by virtue of different historical and other factors but nevertheless there <sup>are</sup> ~~are~~ good chances <sup>enough fertile</sup> ~~and ground~~ for its <sup>similar</sup> ~~development~~ in the Ukraine.



The Soviet invasion ~~dimmed~~ some of these hopes for some time to come.

This did not mean, however, that the process of Ukrainian emancipation will stop. By all means, no. Neither did it mean that the evolutionary form of struggle was to be discarded. On the contrary only through the party and administration it will be possible to achieve necessary goals.

The main prerequisite of success lies, however, in the backing of Ukrainian masses. Therefore, their national enlightenment, their national consciousness is the task number one. And that's precisely on what all efforts are being concentrated.

In the nearest future a further "tightening of screws" is to be expected, but again, this will be caught up by an accelerated development at the next loosening which will come sooner or later.

Dziuba spoke about "a revived Ukrainian impulse" which is not to be quelled. Sooner or later it will come to a direct confrontation between Ukraine and Russia. Only within <sup>the context of</sup> a genuine communism, or rather under liberalized conditions, this confrontation would be "lenient" for both sides, under other circumstances it might take very sharp and critical forms.

In Dziuba's opinion a new, more propitious situation will arise after arrival of young generations at all echelons of the party and administration. This did not mean that young generation on the whole is completely free of Stalinist inclinations but rather that percentage of liberal forces is in it <sup>is</sup> greater than in the present Soviet establishment.

At the present the struggle within the "legalistic framework" is the only one to be applied. One should do nothing to give false pretext for the present establishment to strike a deep blow to the evolving young Ukrainian forces. Again, this did not mean that the establishment will not strike at all under present circumstances, it might do <sup>so</sup>, particularly on the fringes, and this is unavoidable.

b/ Dziuba impressed Source as a convinced, genuine communist (or at least Marxist) and Leninist. He even told her that, for instance, in a nationalist Ukrainian independent state he would be in opposition and would propound communism versus capitalism.

According to Dziuba there are two main trends in the present young Ukrainian poetry - "purely modern" and "politically engaged". He meant, of course, unofficial poetry or non-conformist poetry. The first trend is mainly represented by WOROBYOV, SACHENKO, KORDUN. The second one - by KHOLODNY. The latter performs to a great extent the same role as

SYMONENKO although he is not by far as talented as his late "predecessor". The engaged poetry has explicitly political character and is very popular among masses. This applies in particular to Kholodny who is widely read among students, workers and kolhosponyks. Especially his satirical poems find a strong response among people. Both trends are needed and are "normal" within the framework of current revival of "Ukrainian national impulse". And Dziuba approves of both - abstract and "engaged". Both also prove how strong is the growth of Ukrainian poetry in general.

Dziuba <sup>emphasized</sup> stressed that he was ~~much~~ more interested in <sup>his</sup> ~~his~~ <sup>writing</sup> ~~being~~ read by his <sup>own</sup> people at home <sup>rather</sup> than ~~in~~ <sup>published</sup> ~~publications~~ abroad, <sup>but</sup> he appreciated what has been ~~done~~ <sup>done</sup> along this line abroad, and <sup>will</sup> be grateful for <sup>all</sup> ~~future~~ <sup>future</sup> efforts, ~~in the future~~. However, he has ~~to~~ criticize very strongly ~~all~~ <sup>the</sup> irresponsible attempts on the part of ~~the~~ <sup>emigres who try to</sup> ~~emigration~~ to make a nationalist out of him and <sup>compare him to</sup> ~~put him~~ on equal footing with Ukrainian nationalist politicians ~~and publicists~~. He mentioned as an example a poem in which he was <sup>compared</sup> ~~equalled~~ with Petlura and Bandera, and he called it ~~a~~ <sup>criminal</sup> ~~idiotism~~. People abroad could not even imagine <sup>how</sup> ~~what~~ he and his <sup>colleagues</sup> ~~alike~~ had to suffer for this kind of nonsense for which the KGB and their servants in the Union of Writers ~~were~~ <sup>were</sup> only waiting.

He asked Source to convey to <sup>all</sup> ~~everybody~~ concerned to ~~stop~~ <sup>creating problems</sup> ~~making trouble~~ for him and his friends in the Ukraine by ~~making~~ <sup>in the West</sup> irresponsible, idiotic statements in the press and in the public ~~abroad~~, which only ~~the~~ <sup>supply the regime with</sup> ~~necessary instruments~~ into regime's hand against them. ~~the weapons they seek to use~~ <sup>against them</sup>.

~~He~~ appraised ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> emigration ~~as~~ as follows:

(1) <sup>half</sup> ~~At least~~ of all emigres <sup>the United States</sup> ~~wasting~~ <sup>USA</sup> their time in Canada, ~~USA~~ and other Western countries could and should return to ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> Ukraine and thus strengthen the ~~biological~~ <sup>biological</sup> Ukrainian national potential. ~~This would tremendously help the~~ <sup>help the</sup> ~~Ukrainian cause under present circumstances~~ <sup>present</sup> and would be ~~one of very~~ <sup>one of very</sup> strong factors against forced russification.

(2) <sup>frequently the emigres</sup> ~~Much too~~ <sup>often</sup> ~~emigration~~ <sup>which</sup> ~~writes~~ <sup>and does</sup> things that are skilfully being used by the KGB against him and his <sup>colleagues</sup> ~~alike~~ in the Ukraine, and this is not <sup>a</sup> ~~good~~ reflection on ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~political culture of~~ <sup>political culture of</sup> emigration. ~~It is necessary~~ <sup>It is necessary</sup> ~~almost constantly~~ <sup>almost constantly</sup> ~~he and his alike~~ <sup>he and his alike</sup> have to ~~strike back~~ <sup>strike back</sup> against all kinds of accusations based on ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~idiotic moves~~ <sup>idiotic moves</sup> by the emigres. <sup>by the emigres</sup>

(3) By its nature, <sup>the</sup> emigration is rightist, and <sup>that there are</sup> ~~this was bad~~ it had no leftist, explicitly communist factions. It would be much easier to maintain contacts with the latter. <sup>the</sup> "Progressives" are simply merely tools of <sup>the</sup> regime and all attempts to "engage" them along proper lines have failed. Nevertheless, it would be worthwhile to talk to young progressives and try to involve them in contacts with people in Ukraine. <sup>Dziuba asked the</sup> Incidentally, Source should, <sup>to</sup> eventually, give this problem proper consideration, and should she happen to be in Canada, ~~he advised her to~~ talk with young "progressives".

(4) <sup>the</sup> Emigration should develop contacts not only with rightist but also <sup>with</sup> leftist circles abroad. This would countervail at least to some extent KGB's efforts to identify <sup>the</sup> young Ukrainian movement with the emigration and <sup>with</sup> rightist Western circles, in general.

(5) Dziuba was quite interested in the SDS and thought it would be a good idea to have a Ukrainian SDS abroad with which they (in the Ukraine) could maintain contact. <sup>the</sup> Anyway, he asked Source to <sup>encourage</sup> ~~organize~~ young emigres like herself <sup>to visit</sup> for trips to Ukraine, and <sup>such</sup> the more people ~~will~~ come the better. <sup>some of them</sup> Even if one or two, or several, will decide ~~or will~~ come with a decision, to remain in the Ukraine, <sup>this will be O.K.</sup> "Any accretion to national potential <sup>is</sup> today welcome, <sup>particularly</sup> ~~moreover~~ if it <sup>would be</sup> ~~has to be~~ wasted abroad" - ~~was his final comment.~~

(6) Russians as a nation are also in a miserable state. They have to pay a high price for Russian imperialism and <sup>for the</sup> russification of other peoples. It might sound strange to <sup>the</sup> Source, but russification is also conducive <sup>also</sup> to a national disintegration of Russian people, who are losing more and more of their traditional national features. Also their <sup>socio-</sup> economic status is unenviable. Unfortunately, however, Russians do not understand those facts of life and follow their chauvinistic leadership. <sup>Only</sup> a small group of Russian intellectuals sees <sup>these</sup> problems in <sup>their</sup> proper perspective, but they have little influence in Russian society.

(7) <sup>In the summer of 1968</sup> In June or July 1968 Dziuba was <sup>instructed by the KGB</sup> ~~asked~~ to <sup>submit</sup> ~~write~~ a declaration in <sup>concerning</sup> connection with publication of "Internationalism or Russification". He wrote that the thoughts expressed in the <sup>book</sup> ~~treasure~~ were his, and <sup>that</sup> he continued to subscribe to them. As a communist he deemed it mandatory to present these thoughts to the highest party organs and so ~~did~~ he. He ~~never~~ <sup>did not</sup>.

SECRET

however, ~~was~~ sending his treatise abroad, nor authorized anybody to do so in his behalf. <sup>He was not informed</sup> ~~He~~ he cannot be responsible for <sup>the fact that it was</sup> its publication abroad. <sup>He was not informed</sup> ~~They~~ replied that his statement was "absolutely <sup>not fit to print</sup> unsuitable", he did not ~~write~~ write even "as much as Solzhenitsyn" <sup>had written</sup>.

25. Source <sup>last</sup> saw Dzuba ~~last time~~ on 23 Sept 1968. He told <sup>him</sup> that he was still member of the Union of Writers, the Presidium did not meet on 9 Sept, <sup>and his case was still in abeyance</sup>. Anyway, whatever they do with him he was not going to go <sup>any more</sup> again to their sessions. <sup>again</sup>. He also told Source that ~~finally he~~ <sup>he</sup> became a football fan. <sup>so far</sup>, only ~~Dzuba~~ <sup>he</sup> and Ivanychuk in Lvov ~~are~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~being~~ to football fans.

26. According to people in Kiev and Lvov, political discrimination against Ukrainians was quite often identified with ~~the~~ socio-economic. ~~For instance~~, in Kiev, Ukrainian kindergartens <sup>are</sup> <sup>usually</sup> located in basements. <sup>They</sup> have less qualified personell, and <sup>the</sup> children get only 100g milk per day, whereas in Russian <sup>kindergartens</sup> ~~ones~~ they get 150 g. <sup>milk are distributed</sup>. Also, Russian schools are usually better equipped. ~~As a rule Russians~~ are ~~also in better positions~~ <sup>also</sup>. This fact is ~~conducive to~~ <sup>conducive to</sup> accentuating ~~the~~ Ukrainian national consciousness, in this case based on resentment against <sup>the</sup> Russians.

27. At Lina Kostenko's house Source met <sup>V</sup> KIRYAN Nadiyka, aged 22, single Ukrainian, expelled from ~~the~~ Kiev University (Ukrainian philology) <sup>when a</sup> ~~was found in her room~~ <sup>was found in her room</sup> "Wee from the Wit" by Chornovil, ~~last year~~.

She also had a conflict with the dean of the faculty, and at one of the <sup>at a meeting at the university</sup> ~~meetings~~ "authorities" called her a terrorist. <sup>Everybody was laughing</sup> ~~Everybody was laughing~~ about it, since she is very tiny and hardly <sup>resembles</sup> a terrorist in outlook.

The dean called her a nationalist <sup>the dean</sup> when she came to his office as head of a student group to protest against <sup>the</sup> expulsion of students in the spring 1968. <sup>he called her a nationalist</sup> She writes some poetry, and is under influence of Holoborodko. Her father <sup>lives in the</sup> lives in Poltava area.

At present KIRYAN is working in Kiev botanical garden and half-illegally lives in Dormitory.

Through her Source met also SACHENKO, WOROBYOV, OVDIYENKO and others.

28. <sup>a celebration of</sup> SACHENKO Mykhailo is now at cinematograph school. He wants to be a producer. Two years ago <sup>he</sup> had some trouble with KGB in connection with Symonenko's anniversary <sup>celebration</sup> in Kiev. During ~~Svitlychny's~~ <sup>celebration</sup>.

arrest he happened to come there and almost got arrested, too. *some of his poetry*  
 After ~~it was learned that~~ *he was* his poems were found with Vira Vovk, he ~~was~~ *had* again in trouble for a while  
 but managed to get out of it. He is a gay character, always smiling,  
 energetic, somewhat eccentric.

29. KORDUN, Viktor - a promising young poet, expelled from ~~the~~ *University* ~~and was planning to continue his studies via~~  
 but ~~was going to study by correspondence~~. Together with WOROBYOV, he ~~watched~~ *guarded*  
 orchards in ~~Kolhos~~ *the Kolhoz* Pashkivka, Makarovskiy r-n, Kiev obl.  
 He ~~was~~ *rather* resigned and diffident. He was living in the ~~same room as~~ *with*  
 Worobyov when some ~~zakhvatna~~ *dissident* literature was found ~~and both were~~ *in their room*. They  
 expelled from ~~the~~ *University* ~~still~~ in 1966.

30. WOROBYOV, Mykola - poet, expelled from University ~~in~~ *Kiev* 1966.  
~~then worked on constructions~~ *he later* and now ~~as guard of kolhos~~ *is employed* orchards  
 with KORDUN. ~~Both~~ *he and KORDUN* by the way, were growing ~~thick~~ *long* beards. ~~when the~~ *Source saw them,*

31. OVDIYENKO Mariya - aged 20, of peasant parents from Kiev oblast.  
~~involved~~ *She was* in the case of NAZARENKO Olexsander and KARPENKO Viktor who  
 were arrested on 26 June 1968 as suspected ~~for~~ *in* producing and distributing  
 anti-Soviet leaflets at ~~the~~ *Shevchenko* demonstration on 22 May 1968, in Kiev.  
 NAZARENKO is 38 years old, and KARPENKO is 26.  
 The KGB wanted ~~her~~ *to* OVDIYENKO to admit that she ~~was~~ *ad* typing the leaflets and ~~to~~  
~~witness~~ *be* against NAZARENKO and KARPENKO. She denied everything and  
 suggested ~~that~~ *the KGB* should arrest her ~~too~~ *also* and leave her in peace.  
 The KGB summoned her father and asked him to "talk his daughter into her  
 senses". Her father wept, and she upbraided him in front of the KGB ~~for~~ *his* cowardice.  
 They also tried to ~~prove to~~ *convince* her that she was denounced by others, and ~~they~~  
 even tried to smear CHORNOVIL.  
 She ~~denied everything~~ *was unmoved*. Then ~~they~~ *then* tried to make her admit  
 initiated the leaflets and who ~~else~~ *helped to* was typing them. She ~~denied everything~~ *but she refused*  
 again. ~~to cooperate~~ *to cooperate*.

32. According to LOHVYN STESHENKO Irena was not ~~OK~~ *she trusted*. He suspected  
 her of collaboration with the KGB. Last year when Hevryk Titus visited  
 Kiev, one night ~~(at 1 a.m.)~~ *STESHENKO visited* she suddenly came to Lohvyn's wife at 1 a.m.  
 and asked her to return some document that ~~was given~~ *which* allegedly ~~for~~ *was given*  
~~reading to Titus~~ *shown* to Titus, and which he was to leave with Lohvyn. It looked like  
 an outright provocation.

Source asked Ivan Svitlychny about Steshenko. He ~~did not reply directly~~ but said something to the effect that he had nothing to fear ~~anyway~~ because "they" were after <sup>him</sup> all the time anyway, and it was better to be always cautious and careful in Steshenko's house and <sup>in her</sup> presence. Nevertheless, when Source <sup>accompanied</sup> went with him and Kochur to Steshenko's <sup>home</sup> to pick up books brought by ~~some~~ friends of Vira Vovk, Svitlychny was talking quite openly <sup>in her presence</sup> about HERASYMCHUK, Les' against whom STESHENKO warned, until recently was her lover for several years. ~~Only lately they parted.~~ STESHENKO liked young men and was known in Kiev for <sup>her</sup> most beautiful legs in the city. (In Source's opinion they are not that beautiful. <sup>She was at one time courted by LOHVYN</sup> Allegedly, Herasymchuk ~~had contacts with the KGB in the past.~~ His true name is different and he is Jewish. <sup>the source</sup>

33. In Lohvyn's opinion, Ivan HONCHAR might <sup>be</sup> also a col aborator of the KGB. ~~The~~ introductory <sup>pamphlet</sup> prospect he gives every visitor of his private museum to read and which is composed in very patriotic terms, seems to <sup>be a means of</sup> serve the purpose of provocation. Some visitors are asked to read it aloud and to make comments <sup>about it and</sup> which Honchar allegedly puts on a <sup>hidden tape recorder.</sup>

34. According to <sup>LOHVYN'S</sup> source, Lohvyn's statements about STESHENKO and HONCHAR, but particularly about STESHENKO could be "subjective" since Lohvyn himself was courting at one time STESHENKO.

35. In March 1968, there were distributed at Kiev University leaflets with anti-Russian contents. Among other things it was said in them that ~~the Soviet~~ Russians <sup>like their Tsarist predecessors</sup> were forbidding to celebrate Shevchenko in the same manner as their Tsarist predecessors. In wake of this affair many Ukrainian students were expelled from the University. <sup>the leaflets stated</sup> special meetings of faculty members with Party and KGB officers, <sup>there were 7 of the</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>which led to a</sup> new regulation requiring <sup>for</sup> finally a rule introduced that only those with student identification cards were to be admitted to the premisses of the University. This rule was still valid, <sup>when the source was in Kiev.</sup>

36. In Kiev There is a Ukrainian desiatylitka <sup>(10 years school)</sup> to which mostly Ukrainian dissidents, like KOTSYUBINSKA, SEVRUK and others are sending their children. This school is an experimental one. From the first class pupils <sup>each a</sup> are taught foreign languages, algebra, geometry <sup>and</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>beginning with their</sup> first year at the school.

37. In Kiev Source visited LEVISHCHENKO, and told him about her final decision to return. He knew about her case, asked her a few questions about her <sup>self</sup> biography and her parents, and seemed to be very depressed.

38. Around 15 Sept 1968 Source has a small incident with militia in Kiev. At Lavra a militiaman shouted down at an old peasant woman and asked her to leave the place. Source took her in defence and finally landed at militia precinct. There she ~~read them a lesson that as~~ <sup>in Russian</sup> ~~communists they have to respect human feelings and convictions, incl. the religious ones, and above all they must respect Soviet constitution, behave properly and speak in the Ukraine. Ukrainian. Only at the precinct she told them that she was a German citizen and there was a general confusion after that.~~ <sup>she as a result informed them that as these should convictions that Soviet of the Ukraine. Ukrainian. Only at the precinct she told them that she was a German citizen and there was a general confusion after that.</sup>

✓ a Similar incident she had with another militiaman on 23 Sept at Pyregova street in Kiev when waiting for DZYUBA at a bus stop. As usually, DZYUBA was one hour or so late, and Source was sitting on the curb in trousers, and cigarette in her mouth. After a while a militiaman approached her and asked why (was she) sitting there, ~~he~~ <sup>it</sup> implied that she might be a prostitute. Source told him off, and again started with his behaviour, Russian in speaking ~~and~~ <sup>berating him for speaking</sup> ~~the militiaman threatened that he will arrest her, and~~ <sup>to register</sup> ~~she told him that as a foreign citizen she was going to complain him against him at her Consulate. The militiaman changed at once and apologized for his conduct. In the meantime DZYUBA watched them from the side and then commended Source for the lesson she taught "the khakhol".~~ <sup>his tone</sup> ~~later~~

*Insert 39 from next page*

~~for one day~~ <sup>in</sup> Early Aug 1968 Source went with her niece, a RR conductor, to ODESSA and on 13 Aug again to UZGOROD. She had no permission.

Similarly, on 18 Sept she made a trip with her friend CHYLAK Aleksander of Warsaw to Kamyanets-Podolsky, then to Khotyn and by plane to Chernivtsi.

From Khotyn to Chernivtsi she flew in a "Kukurudzianyk" (~~altogether~~ <sup>they</sup> 6 passengers), and paid 4 Rubel one way. From Chernivtsi she went to Lvov and on 22 Sept flew from Lvov to Kiev. (She paid Rubel 10, <sup>for the trip from Lvov to Kiev,</sup> ~~for~~ her ticket from Lvov to Kiev). On 24 Sept 1968 Source left by plane for Warsaw at 9.00 hrs and arrived there at 10.30 hrs.

In Warsaw she stayed with Chylak's parents, went to "Nasze Slovo", met some Ukrainians in Warsaw, incl. BOBERSKI Bogdan, DZWINKA and others, and on 26 Sept 1968 left by train at 11.00 hrs for Frankfurt/Main.

Around 20.00 hrs ~~next day~~ <sup>the</sup> She was in Frankfurt/Main about 8 p.m. <sup>next day.</sup> Source was interviewed on 29 Sept 1968.

